DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 277 JC 820 513

TITLE	Identifying and Assisting Transfer Students: Survey of Current Policies and Practices. California Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	Sep 82
NOTE	42p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Advising; Administrative Policy; *Articulation (Education); College School Cooperation; *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Educational Counseling; Intercollegiate Cooperation; Questionnaires; State Surveys; Student Educational Objectives; *Student Personnel Services; Teacher Role; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

In 1982, a study was conducted by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges to determine the policies and practices that guide the state's community colleges in identifying and assisting potential transfer students. A questionnaire was distributed to all 106 community colleges, seeking information on social programs/activities to identify and assist potential transfers; the success of these activities; faculty role in facilitating transfer; required individual or group advisement; articulation efforts with other educational levels; and recommendations for improvements in current practices. Survey findings, based on an 85% response rate, included the following; (1) 66% of the colleges had special mechanisms to identify potential transfers, with the most common being self-designation on college forms and counseling at registration; (2) while 38% of the colleges felt it was the student's responsibility to identify him/herself as a transfer student and obtain the appropriate services, 29% reported that faculty, counselors, and administrators encourage students in the course of their studies; (3) the most common forms of assistance were counseling services and "college days or nights"; (4) 34% of the colleges felt that a more formal matriculation procedure would improve the identification of potential transfers; and (5) 69% of the schools had formal articulation agreements with four-year institutions and 52% had regular liaisons with local high schools. The questionnaire is appended. (KL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223277

VC 820 513

California Community Colleges

IDENTIFYING AND ASSISTING TRANSFER STUDENTS: SURVEY OF CURRENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

COLLEGE SERVICES UNIT

September 1982

Introduction

The "transfer function" in community colleges is the longest standing and most widely known function performed by community colleges. Transfer courses and programs enable students to commence their baccalaureate degree programs on community college campuses and to transfer lower division, baccalaureate level work to four year degree-granting institutions. From their earliest years, California's "junior colleges" were responsive to local occupational, economic and cultural needs; but it was in the transferable offerings that the greatest numbers of students enrolled, and it was largely the colleges' success in transfer education that firmly insured their position as a major component of higher education by the time California's Master Plan for Higher Education was adopted in 1960.

Even before the Master Plan was approved (during the period of dramatic growth that began after World War II), notable shifts had begun to occur in the "balance" of educational functions performed by community colleges. Transfer courses began to decrease relative to overall course offerings. Still, transfer programs remained--certainly in the public's view--as the "base" function. But in the two decades which followed, dramatic changes occurred. The federal government steadily increased its support of vocational education with funds not only to support new local level programs but also to support state administration and statewide program development efforts. Local "matching" expenditures for vocational programs far exceeded requirements until today they amount to more than ten times the federal funds. Perhaps even more important, in the long run, communities increasingly supported the concept of "continuing education" by enrolling in unprecedented numbers in courses which might or might not be part of baccalaureate or vocational programs but which served individual educational aspirations and needs. Further, state and federal actions based on broader social trends resulted in the establishment of special programs designed to provide educational access to groups not historically served in proportion to their numbers. Significant among these in California are the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), the Handicapped Students' Programs and Services (AB 77) and the 1976 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act, as well as the passage, at the federal level, of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and Title 9 of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Importantly, all of these and other program expansion trends merged in a context of economic affluence and of a society supportive of virtually unrestrained growth. One feature of this context was widespread adherence to the concept of "universal higher education"; that is, that national economic well-being could be served, in an increasingly technological society, by making post-high school education accessible to all and the related idea that a much larger proportion of the populace than had previously participated had the capability to benefit from such education. The cumulative result, of course, was unprecedented growth in the number of both community colleges and community college students. Less apparent during the period, however, were the effects of this growth on patterns of

student enrollments among the various educational programs offered and functions performed by community colleges. With the strong emphasis on access and on responding to citizens' educational preferences, the community colleges--whose resources were still predominantly derived from local revenues--often focused on widening the "open door," and the delineations among transfer, vocational and other functions became, in many cases, less precise. Indeed, it is apparent from some responses to survey items presented in this report, that there may have even developed a school of thought that too clear delineation among the various functions is antithetical to the colleges' commitments to access and freedom of educational choice.

In any event, by 1976, a report by the California Postsecondary Education Commission posited the following as its major finding: "Thus, continuing education for part-time, adult students has become the dominant function of community colleges, with no resultant neglect of the occupational, transfer and general education functions for more traditional students."[1] That conclusion was based on a finding not that the colleges were offering fewer courses applicable to baccalaureate or vocational programs or relevant to traditional students, but rather that the characteristics of the students taking the courses and the purposes for which they were taking them had both changed. The earning of degrees and certificates had become, and remains today, secondary, at least as measured by number of enrollees, to the function of providing ongoing education to adults, whose motivations range from professional upgrading and retraining to strictly avocational pursuits.

During the second half of the 1970's, national and state trends further changed the community colleges, and may well have contributed to current concerns about the efficacy of transfer preparation programs. As a result of economic conditions and changing employment trends, a decreasing proportion of all students, even the traditional college-age persons, were opting for baccalaureate degree programs and more were choosing vocational options. At the same time, the pool of traditional college-age persons was itself decreasing in size, as a result of declining birthrates during the preceding decade. While it is not clear whether or how it is related to these other trends, there was also a marked decline among high school students in performance on nationally standardized tests of language and math skills. Finally, the social and economic context within which these more recent trends have emerged is dramatically different from that in which the longer term trends, described above, occurred. Rather than affluence and phenomenal growth, the recent scene has been marked by severe economic decline and increasing restrictions on enrollment growth. In such a context, it is not unreasonable to expect closer examination of the efficiency of public services. It is against this background that a closer examination of the "transfer function" as part of the mission of community colleges has developed.

As noted earlier, the 1976 finding that continuing education for part-time, adult students had become the dominant community college function did not suggest that there had been a decrease in the availability of or enrollment in transfer or vocational offerings.

---

[1] "Through the Open Door: A Study of Paterns of Enrollment and Performance in California's Community Colleges," CPEC, February 1976.

Rather, even with a declining pool of high school graduates, increasing numbers of "non-traditional" students have caused enrollments in those offerings to remain high.

While enrollments have increased, the California Postsecondary Education Commission has called attention to the fact that, from 1976 to the present there has been a decline in the number of students actually transferring to the University of California. In 1978, the second year of the documented decline, the Legislature included language in the Budget bill which required the three public postsecondary segments to jointly prepare a report on how to ". . .improve the rate and retention of community college transfer students from underrepresented groups." The following year, the legislative language expanded its scope of concern to community college transfers in general and directed CPEC, in cooperation with the segments, to prepare a plan regarding transfers. The plan committed the California Community Colleges to identifying the number of "potential transfer students" who might reasonably be expected to transfer, and assisting the public four-year segments to identify and assist potential transfers.

In the meantime, the decline in transfers to the University continued as a source of concern, and other incidents occurred which elevated the transfer function issue to greater prominence. A study conducted by the University of California suggested that the post-transfer accademic performance of some community college transfers was less than acceptable. Articles appeared in several newspapers calling attention to these findings as well as to what was considered the surprisingly low rate of transfers from community colleges to four-year colleges. Moreover, the California Postsecondary Education Commission produced a "white paper" in Spring, 1981 on the Mission of Community Colleges. That paper was intended to stimulate discussion about all dimensions of the colleges' mission including the continued viability of the transfer function.

In addition to pursuing the commitments made in the 1980 plan prepared by CPEC, the Chancellor Hayward and the President of the University of California issued a joint statement reconfirming support for the transfer function; and the Chancellor directed staff to undertake a series of activities designed to assess the current state of transfer programs. The report which follows is the result of one of these activities, a questionnaire survey which aimed to ascertain how colleges identify and provide assistance to potential transfer students. In addition to providing this information to the Board of Governors, the report is to be used for discussion in local and regional intersegmental meetings and workshops designed to improve understanding and practice among the segments regarding the transfer function.

Methodology

The original charge to conduct this survey was contained in the 1980 plan, prepared by CPEC and the segments. That charge was to assist the four-year segments in identifying potential community college transfer students. After discussing the charge with various advisory bodies, it was determined by staff that such assistance could be provided only if there were first a more clear and complete understanding of the policies and practices which currently guide the colleges in identifying and providing assistance to potential transfer students. Since the Chancellor's Office does not routinely gather such information, it was decided that a special survey should be conducted of all districts and colleges.

Advisory groups agreed that there was probably considerable variability among the districts' policies and practices, with respect to both the amount and types of assistance provided and the categories of college personnel providing it. Comments of individuals within the groups suggested that such variability might also reflect philosophical differences among the districts as to how far they should monitor or intervene in students' educational choices. Therefore, the staff convened an ad hoc advisory group to assist in planning for the survey. It was comprised of representatives of the Academic Senate and statewide professional associations representing counselors, admission and records officers, deans of instruction, deans of students, and students. In addition, a representative of the California Community and Junior College Association worked closely with staff, not only in the advisory group meetings, but also in the final development of the survey instrument, and, subsequently, in the preliminary analysis of the results.

In addition to providing much advice concerning the specific content and phrasing of survey items, the advisory group posited four basic principles regarding development of the survey instrument. They were:

1. The survey instructions should encourage respondents to consider a very broad definition of the term "potential transfer student," and should provide examples of the types of students who might be considered within such a definition.

2. Survey questions should allow for open-ended, narrative responses in order to accommodate a presumed wide range of policies, practices and perspectives on the issues.

3. The survey should, in addition to probing policies and practices regarding assistance to students, also probe institutional articulation efforts with high schools and baccalaureate degree granting institutions.

4. The survey should ask respondents what changes might be made, in each area of inquiry, to improve current practice.

The questionnaire used for this survey appears in Appendix A.

Administration of and Response to the Survey

Prior to mailing the survey to campuses, the Chancellor sent a policy memorandum to superintendents and presidents expressing his viewpoint on public challenges to the community colleges' transfer function and urging cooperation with the series of activities he had directed staff to undertake. He specifically requested each campus to appoint a broadly representative committee to prepare responses to the survey. The survey was sent in late July and responses were returned over the following three months.

Completed surveys were returned by 94 (89 percent) of the 106 community colleges. Of these, 90 (85 percent) were useable for analysis. Sixty-five of the 70 community colleges districts are represented in the analysis.

It should be noted that there was significant variation in the composition of the groups who prepared the campuses' survey responses. Forty-two (47 percent) were prepared by noninstructional administrators, including 19 (21 percent) prepared by one individual. Twenty-nine (33 percent) were prepared by groups that included administrators, faculty and counselors, and 15 (17 percent) were prepared by administrators, including instructional administrators. Eight campuses included a student in the respondent group. Given the wide range of areas of inquiry included in the survey and the size and complexity of many campuses, this variation probably had some effect on the completeness and accuracy of responses. As noted in the "Analysis" section below, this possible variability in the completeness of responses should be kept clearly in mind in interpreting the aggregated data.

Analysis of Survey Results

As noted above, the assumed variability in districts' policies and practices in the areas of inquiry made it necessary, in a first effort, to pose open-ended survey questions rather than to provide predetermined response categories. This permitted colleges to describe their policies or practices in their own words. Therefore, the chief methodological technique employed in analyzing the responses was a two-stage content analysis. In the first stage, each of three staff members individually read each item response from one-third of the responding colleges, noting the incidence of each "type" of response and creating descriptive phrases of practices which were found most often. The three readers then met and discussed and compared the categories they had developed for each item and came to agreement on the phrasing which most accurately described their common findings. Then, in the second stage, all questionnaires were re-read by at least two readers, tabulating the incidence of responses under the commonly agreed-upon categories. Comparisons of readers' tabulations were then made to correct the discrepancies which occurred due to reader error.

This two-stage method assures a reasonable level of reliability in the quantifying of responses which actually appeared on the surveys. The reader should take careful note, however, that allowing respondents to provide open-ended, self-generated responses in itself introduces the possibility of significant error of other types--largely errors of omission. As noted earlier, the persons who prepared institutional responses serve in a variety of capacities on the campuses. In 19 cases, responses were prepared by a single individual. If it may be assumed that no individual is fully aware of all relevant campus policies and practices regarding transfer, or would describe them fully, then it is clear that the aggregated information in the report is not necessarily a full and completely accurate record. For example, a large number of colleges indicated that potential transfer students are identified in counseling sessions held in conjunction with registration. Some colleges explicitly stated that such sessions were optional for students and others that they were required, either of all students or of some sub-category of students, such as EOPS or students enrolled for some minimum number of units. In a large number of cases, however, it was not stated whether such sessions were optional or required; and those responses were tabulated as "optional." Thus, the actual incidence of required counseling at registration may be higher than is reported.

With this important caveat in mind, however, staff believe that the survey results presented below provide the most comprehensive and accurate picture to date of colleges' policies and practices regarding identification and assistance to transfers. Interpretations of the data are necessarily tempered by the limitations noted above.

Survey Findings

The first section of the survey probed college policy and practice with respect to identifying those students who might be considered "potential transfer students." This was followed, in order, by questions about: 1) assistance provided to students who wish to consider transferring; 2) the roles of faculty in assisting transfers; 3) required program advisement; 4) articulation efforts with four-year colleges; and 5) articulation efforts with high schools.

Identification of Potential Transfers

A number of documents that emerged during public discussions of the transfer function over the past few years have used the phrase "identifying . ." or "identification of . ." potential transfers. The implication of this usage, in most instances, is that colleges are aware of the educational goals of individual students and that they have a responsibility--perhaps even specific mechanisms--for gaining such an awareness. In discussions with the ad hoc advisory group, as well as with other advisory committees, the idea of "identifying" transfers was found to be confusing to some and controversial to others.

The first item of the survey asked, "Does your college have special programs and/or activities designed to identify potential transfer students?" The results, displayed in Table 1A, show that 59 colleges (66 percent) said they do have such programs, and 30 (33 percent) said they do not.

Table 1A

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting "Special Programs and/or Activities Designed to Identify Potential Transfer Students"

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Yes	59	66
2. No	30	33
3. No Answer	1	1

However, the enumeration of those "special activities or programs," shown in Table 1B, makes clear that the range of activities denoted as "special" is very wide. Indeed, some colleges that said they do not have "special" programs to identify went on to describe activities very similar to those who said they did. Thus, depending on what one considers "special" and how one defines "identification," it might be true that virtually all colleges have some activities that could be named.

Table 1B displays the most common types of identification mechanisms. Sixty-three colleges (70 percent) said that students identify their intentions to transfer on college applications and/or registration study lists. Responses to this and other items led the readers to conclude, however, that few colleges use these self-designations in systematic ways to provide students with any particular, subsequent assistance. A sizeable majority of the colleges also noted the existence of counseling at registration as a means of identifying potential transfers--either for students in general or for specific groups. Eighteen colleges (20 percent) noted that counseling at registration is required of at least some students (e.g. students enrolled for some minimum number of units); and others (12 percent) noted that it is required for students in specially funded programs, such as EOPS. A larger number of colleges also called attention to optional registration counseling. About one out of every five colleges also noted the following activities as means of identifying potential transfers:

1. Visits of four-year college representatives to the campus (22 percent);
2. Self-identification at time of filing major declaration (21 percent); and
3. College-sponsored orientation sessions or courses (20 percent).

And smaller but significant numbers of colleges noted that students may be identified as transfers in special sessions about transfer procedures conducted by EOPS (16 percent), counseling staffs (13 percent) or faculty in departments (8 percent).

TABLE 1B

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Institutional Mechanisms for Identifying Potential Transfers

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Student self-identification on college application or registration study list	63	70
2. Counseling at entrance registration (general student body):		
- Required	18	20
- Optional	32	36
3. Specialized counseling at entrance for/by specially funded programs (e.g., EOPS, women, etc.)		
- Required	11	12
- Optional	6	7
4. Four year colleges' representatives identify in visit to campuses	20	22
5. Students identify transfer plans on major declaration sheet	19	21
6. Student identified in orientation sessions (including orientation courses)	18	20
7. Students identified in special sessions about transfer conducted by:		
- EOPS staff	14	16
- Counseling faculty	12	13
- Instructional faculty in major departments	7	8
8. Identified by placement testing		
- Required	10	11
- Optional	2	2
9. Identified in evaluation of high schools transcript	6	7
10. Other	13	15

Thus, it appears that there is a wide range of activities which are viewed by colleges as possible means of identifying transfer students. Probably more important, it appears that there is significant variation in the extent to which colleges feel responsible for identifying such students. Responses to the item "Estimate how completely your current efforts identify each of the potential transfer student aggregates listed below. . ." may reflect this variation (Table 2).

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Success of Institutional Efforts in Identifying Potential Transfer Students

Student Aggregates	Response Category											
Students Who:	Almost All Are Identified		About 3/4 Are Identified		About 1/2 Are Identified		About 1/4 Are Identified		Almost None Are Identified		N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Are eligible upon high school graduation	7	8	12	13	7	8	14	16	43	48	9	10
2. Are in the process of becoming eligible as they earn acceptable GPA in UC/CSUC transferable units	21	23	18	20	18	20	9	10	19	21	5	6
3. Are performing successfully in transferable courses with no explicit intentions to transfer	12	13	11	12	12	13	14	16	34	38	7	8
4. Are performing successfully in career/vocational courses and programs	15	17	19	21	15	17	7	8	22	24	12	13
5. Identify themselves as planning to transfer	45	50	10	11	18	20	4	4	7	8		
6. Previously attended a four-year institution without completing a baccalaureate degree	33	37	9	10	7	8	13	14	27	30		
7. Are from groups which have not traditionally aspired to or been acknowledged as qualifying for transfer	19	21	16	18	10	11	14	16	25	28		
8. Other	2		1		1		1		1			

Note that few colleges claim to have identified "almost all" the students in any transfer category, except those who identify themselves as transfers on an application; and large percentages of the colleges (51-70 percent) indicate that half or less of the transfer students in any aggregate listed are identified as such. A number of colleges did point out that the descriptions of the aggregates were not consistent with the ways they typically view students; this discrepancy could have affected those responses. Nevertheless, it seems clear that at least a majority of the colleges would not claim that their existing mechanisms identify a high proportion of potential transfer students. Comments written on some questionnaires suggest that this is not viewed as a "failure" but rather reflects an implicit college policy that students ought not be "tracked" early on as transfer, vocational or otherwise.

One questionnaire item attempted to get at this issue more directly by requesting ". . .comment on your institution's policy and practice with respect to whether or when it is appropriate to actively encourage students to consider transferring to a four-year college." Responses to this item were varied and complex, but the readers found that the essence of responses were categorizable as shown on Table 3A.

TABLE 3A

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Policies with Respect to Encouraging Transfer

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Identifying potential transfers early desirable, and we utilize required entrance testing, advisement, high school transcript analysis, etc., to do so.	19	21
2. Institutional policy is that a student should take the initiative to identify herself/himself as a transfer and avail herself/himself of institutional resources designed to assist in that goal.	34	38
3. No policy or insufficient info about practices to infer policy.	22	24
4. No answer.	15	17

*Note that 26 colleges (29%) reported that individual instructional faculty members, counseling faculty or administrators in general identify and encourage individual students in the course of their studies. (This response was also made by some colleges listed above.)

Table 3B displays the practices which colleges said are typical of their efforts to "identify" transfers. Notice that, consistent with the categorization of policy types in Table 3A, a minority of colleges reported required activities which enable them to learn students' future educational plans. These include required counseling or orientation at registration for those registered for more than some minimum number of units (usually eight units), or required counseling until some maximum number of units (usually 30) is completed. A larger number emphasized that identification of students' goals is an ongoing activity and occurs through students' use of campus counseling and other provided services or through the contacts of individual faculty members with individual students. Clearly, it is not the dominant mode among the colleges, to make a record of students as "transfers" (or any other grouping) even when it may be known that transfer is a student's objective.

TABLE 3B

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting
Institutional Practices to Actively Encourage
Students to Consider Transfer

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Required counseling at entrance	10	11
2. Required orientation for students enrolled in eight units or more	6	7
3. Required counseling until 30 units completed	4	5
4. Identified on an individual basis by faculty and counselors	9	10
5. Identification is an ongoing activity	8	9
6. Resources are available for those who seek counseling, but participation is voluntary	35	39
7. Active identification of potential transfers and activities to encourage transfer	12	13
8. Other	6	7

Assistance to Potential Transfers

Leaving the question of "identification," per se, the questionnaire went on to probe what sorts of assistance are provided to students regarding transfer options, whether or not the institution actively attempts to identify them as transfers. Table 4 shows that the two most common forms of assistance are:

1. Providing the services of counselors who are knowledgeable about transfer requirements and options; and

2. Hosting representatives of four-year college "Relations with Schools" offices on campus, including the sponsoring of "college days or nights" at which many colleges are represented.

Additionally, about one-fourth of the colleges said they:

1. Conduct occasional, special sessions on campus for students desiring to learn of requirements; and

2. Publish and distribute special documents intended to be useful to potential transfers.

TABLE 4

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting
Institutional Practices and/or Special Program
Activities Designed to Assist Potential Transfer Students

	Response Category	Number	Percent
1.	Four-year university representatives on college campus (including night college)	48	53
2.	Individual counseling (option and required)	58	64
3.	Advice by instructional faculty	19	21
4.	General information on transfer (including orientation sessions)	11	12
5.	Special sessions on transfer requirements	24	27
6.	Publications on transfer	22	24
7.	Major and departmental student clubs	8	9
8.	Other (e.g. participation on South Coast Higher Education and Articulation Councils)	14	16

Again, about one-fifth of the colleges pointed out that individual faculty members play an important, if informal, role in assisting transfer students; and others noted what may be a more formal faculty role through the provision of transfer information in special departmental sessions and clubs for majors.

Small but notable numbers of colleges pointed out their involvement in formally organized, intersegmental student services, such as the "South Coast Higher Education Consortium," one of the regional efforts funded by the California Student Opportunity and Access Program CAL-SOAP program initiated by the Legislature.

Finally, though it is not shown in Table 4, it is important to note that about one-half of the respondents noted that special programs like EOPS, centers for women and veterans and programs for disabled students frequently provide more directive transfer assistance to their students. These services are not necessarily available to all students on campus.

As noted above, several colleges noted the role of faculty members both in identifying and providing assistance to potential transfers. The questionnaire requested colleges to comment specifically on policy and practice regarding the roles of faculty, compared to student services personnel, in providing transfer assistance. Table 5A shows that 12 colleges stated specific college policies regarding faculty in this area and an additional 29 indicated that, while no written policy exists, the implied policy is that transfer advisement is a role that faculty share with the college counseling staff. Thirty-seven colleges simply said they have no policy regarding the roles of faculty in this area.

TABLE 5A

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Policies with Respect to Roles of Instructional Faculty in Identifying and Assisting Potential Transfer Students

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Specific policy quoted	12	13
2. Implied general policy to support working relationships between instructional faculty and counseling faculty	29	32
3. No specific written policy	37	41
4. No answer	12	13

Regardless of the existence of formal policies, however, Table 5B shows the ways colleges described their practices regarding faculty involvement in transfer advisement. Note that seven colleges reported that they have a specific transfer advisement program involving faculty in which the district invests resources and/or which requires the participation of faculty as part of their workload. An additional 13 colleges described formal transfer advisement activities or programs involving faculty; but in these cases faculty participation is voluntary. The largest number of colleges (42) did not indicate the existence of any special program, but suggested that faculty play an important role as "resources" available to students, usually through individual contact and initiative. Finally, 17 colleges chose to indicate that the faculty--and, in some cases, counselors as well--have no obligatory role in assisting students who want to transfer. Staff readers interpret these last responses, for the most part, as not necessarily representing an institutional posture, but rather the lack of a formal definition of roles.

TABLE 5B

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Institutional Practices with Respect to Roles of Instructional Faculty in Identifying and Assisting Potential Transfer Students

	Response Category	Number	Percent
1.	Specific activity or program which costs districts monies or requires instructional faculty participation	7	8
2.	Specific activity or program which fosters instructional faculty serving as voluntary advisory	13	14
3.	General instructional faculty serving as resources (primarily individual and classroom contact)	42	47
4.	Other (Students' responsibility to self-identify)	17	18
5.	No response	11	12

Recall that in describing responses to questions about identification of and provision of assistance to potential transfers it was noted that a minority of colleges reported "required" activities for those purposes. A separate questionnaire item asked specifically whether the colleges require either individual or group advisement (without specifying the purposes) and, if so, for what categories of students. Tables 6A and 6B display the responses to that item, and suggest a somewhat greater degree of directiveness on the part of colleges than could be inferred from the items on transfer advisement per se. Note, on Table 6A, that only 11 colleges (12 percent) said they had no required counseling or advisement. An additional five colleges (6 percent) did not respond to the item, leaving 74 (82 percent) who indicated that at least some group(s) of students are required to have individual or group counseling or both.

Table 6B elaborates the "required counseling" practices by showing the incidence of provision to various groups of students.

TABLE 6A

*Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Policies with Respect to Required Advisement

Response	Category	Number	Percent
Yes	Individual	35	39
Yes	Group	18	20
Yes	Both	41	46
No	Required	11	12
No Response		5	6

*Note that responses tally more than 100% because some colleges reported "Individual" counseling for defined population; "Group" counseling for another and "Both" for yet another.

TABLE 6B

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Practices with Respect to Required Individual Advisement

	Response Category	Number	Percent
1.	Financial Aide/EOPS	43	48
2.	First time day and evening students in 6 units or more	27	30
3.	Veterans	23	26
4.	Probationary	20	22
5.	All first time students	20	22
6.	Special majors (e.g. nursing)	15	17
7.	Disabled	13	14
8.	F-1 foreign students	9	10
9.	Continuing students enrolled in 6 units or more	8	9
10.	Other	21	23

Individual required counseling was noted most frequently (47 percent) for first-time enrollees at registration. In 20 colleges (22 percent) it is reported as being required for all new students; and in 27 additional colleges (30 percent) it is required for new students who are enrolled for more than a specified number of units (usually eight). Notice that eight colleges (nine percent) reported that they continue to require registration counseling in subsequent terms if the student enrolls for at least the specified minimum units.

The other groups for whom individual required counseling/advisement most commonly is conducted (presumably at times in addition to registration) are those students affiliated with special programs: EOPS and/or financial aid recipients at 43 colleges (48 percent); veterans at 23 colleges (26 percent) and foreign students at nine colleges (10 percent).

Fifteen colleges (17 percent) also indicated that individual counseling is required of students in certain majors, such as nursing; and 20 colleges (22 percent) indicated required counseling for students on academic probation.

Group required counseling is conducted in a smaller number of colleges, but where it exists, it is typically required for the same categories of students as are individual sessions.

Table 6C displays the reasons given by seven of the 11 colleges which said they did not require any categories of students to have counseling. All seven that provided responses mentioned that fiscal or staffing resources or both prohibited the requirement. Six also said that college policy dictates that it must be the student's decision to seek counseling. Five colleges gave other specific reasons why required counseling is not feasible in a community college, including; a) students don't need it after initial enrollment; b) part-time students don't need it, and since they are the majority, college practice should be geared to them; c) most students are in college for "continuing education" purposes and don't need or want counseling and d) "Ours is a non-traditional admission process."

TABLE 6C

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting the Reasons for not Requiring Advisement

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Resources (dollars and people) not available	7	8
2. College policy dictates seeking advisement is the student's decision	6	7
3. Identifying groups that are not required to have advisement	2	2
a) Part-time students	2	2
b) After first semester advisement is not needed	3	3
c) Continuing education enrolled students	3	3
d) Nontraditional admission process	1	1
4. No response	74	82

The last item in that section of the questionnaire having to do with identifying and assisting potential transfer students asked respondents to indicate the ways by which they thought they could improve their identification of and assistance to potential transfer students.

With respect to "identification" of transfers, 27 (30 percent) of the colleges said they could improve by systematically following up on information already available; that is, by contacting students who perform well on entrance placement tests, have good GPA's, perform well in transfer courses or indicate on their applications or registration sheets that they are considering transfer. Thirty-one colleges (34 percent) said it would be an improvement if they instituted a more formal matriculation procedure than they now have. Specific examples of more formal procedures included mandating skills testing or assessment for new students and requiring and/or evaluating high school transcripts of new students.

With respect to "assistance" to transfers, the suggestions given varied widely, but few were different from practices reported by one or more colleges in the survey as already existing. For example, the largest single response was to "provide special orientation sessions for transfers" (12 percent) and the second most common was "offer special counseling and/or faculty advising programs for transfers" (9 percent). Four colleges said assistance would be improved by extending required counseling to include part-time students.

TABLE 7A

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting
Ways Institutions can Improve the
Identification of Potential Transfer Students

	Response Category	Number	Percent
1.	Instituting a more formal matriculation procedure, requiring and evaluating high school transcripts, and mandating student entrance assessment emphasizing "testing" or skill assessment.	31	34
2.	Contacting students who perform well on placement tests, have good GPA's, perform well in transfer courses or indicate on applications or on registration sheets that they are considering to transfer.	27	30
3.	Other	8	9
4.	No response	24	27

TABLE 7B

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting ways to Improve Assistance to Potential Transfer Students

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Holding orientation classes for transfer students	11	12
2. Offer special counseling, advising programs	8	9
3. Requiring counseling services for part-time students	4	4
4. Other	25	28
5. No response	42	47

Articulation with Other Segments of Education

The third major section of the questionnaire was designed to inquire into another dimension of the transfer function--that is, the colleges' working relationships with other educational segments.

Tables 8A and 8B display the colleges' assessments of the effectiveness of their articulation efforts with the three other segments of postsecondary education and with high schools in ". . . assuring that all potential transfer students are provided. . ." a) adequate "information" and b) adequate "assistance." The distinction between "information" and "assistance" was recommended by the survey advisory committee, with the notion that "information" may be made available to students with minimal investment of time or effort by personnel (e.g. through catalogs and brochures) and is made more effective when supplemented by "assistance," which requires a greater investment of personnel time and effort. If the distinction is valid, comparison of the data in Tables 8A and B show that colleges rate their articulation efforts with all segments as being somewhat more effective in providing information than in providng assistance to students.

TABLE 8A

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Articulation with Other Educational Institutions with Regard to Information

Response Category	Very Effective		Very Effective		Not Very Effective	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Local high schools	42	47	40	44	6	7
2. Local CSUC campuses	54	60	35	39	1	1
3. Local UC campuses	38	42	45	50	3	3
4. Local private 4-year campuses	21	23	44	49	18	20

TABLE 8B

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Articulation with Other Educational Institutions to Assure Assistance to Students

Response Category	Very Effective		Effective		Not Very Effective	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Local high schools	36	40	39	43	16	18
2. Local CSUC campuses	45	50	38	42	5	6
3. Local UC campuses	32	36	48	53	6	7
4. Local private 4-year campuses	19	21	47	52	16	18

In addition, the tables reflect interesting differences in effectiveness among the segments. Among postsecondary segments, the community colleges almost unanimously rate their efforts with the California State University as "effective" or "very effective." University of California relations also rate quite high, but significantly fewer colleges said their relations with UC are "very effective." Relations with private postsecondary colleges are rated significantly less effective than either of the public segments, with about 20 percent of the colleges even indicating that their relations are "not very effective" for assuring either information or assistance to potential transfer students. Relations with high schools were reported as being about on a par with UC, except that 16 colleges (18 percent) said their relations with local high schools were "not very effective" in providing assistance to students.

Unfortunately, the questionnaire did not ask respondents to indicate the reasons for ineffective segmental relations. One might speculate that the UC vs CSU differences are related to CSU's efforts to develop formal, uniform statewide policies regarding transfer of community college credit and fulfillment of general education requirements. By contrast, UC's policies vary from campus to campus. If that is the case, the even greater lack of uniformity among private institutions could account for their even lower articulation effectiveness rating. One might also speculate as to whether these distinctions may be related to the recent decline in transfers to the UC without a comparable decline in transfers to the CSU.

Table 9 displays the types of intersegmental activities college respondents named in describing their articulation efforts with other postsecondary segments.

TABLE 9

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Institutional Practices with Respect to Articulation with Other Colleges and Universities

Response Category	Effective	
	Number	Percent
1. Updated articulation agreements with local 4-year colleges and universities	62	69
2. On-going communication by phone as need arises	28	31
3. Activities which allow information to be gathered, exchanged, and be made available to students (e.g. college days, recruiting days, student visitations, etc.)	65	72
4. On-going cooperative work and exchange between division deans/faculty of community colleges and 4-year college or university	24	27
5. Attending meetings on articulation	32	36
6. Counselors articulate by specific major	12	13
7. Assistance available for individual students	12	13
8. Other	16	18

Sixty-two colleges (69 percent) pointed to formal articulation agreements with nearby four-year colleges, which included both subject matter/curriculum agreements and more general agreements regarding transfer of credit and satisfaction of general education and major requirements. Sixty-five colleges (72 percent) named hosting of four-year college representatives for individual visits and college days and nights as another important liaison activity. Thirty-two colleges (36 percent) indicated that they participate in intersegmental meetings and conferences on articulation. Several other response categories indicate that individual and small group contacts between community college and four-year college personnel are also important to maintaining strong intersegmental ties. For example, 28 colleges (31 percent) mentioned frequent communication by phone regarding specific needs, such as calls on behalf of students who have applied to transfer, inquiries regarding course equivalencies, and making arrangements for meetings on topics of mutual interest. In addition, 24 colleges (27 percent) described ongoing exchange between division deans and departmental faculty in the community colleges with their subject matter counterparts in four-year institutions. Twelve colleges (13 percent) also said that their counselors have specialized relationships with departmental contacts in four-year colleges to facilitate the transfer of students in those majors.

Table 10 displays the colleges' responses to an item which asked them to suggest how their current articulation efforts with four-year colleges could be improved in order to better assist potential transfer students.

TABLE 10

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Ways to Improve Articulation with Other Colleges and Universities

	Response Category	Number	Percent
1.	Frequently updating articulation agreements	21	23
2.	Assignment of full-time professional staff	21	23
3.	More assistance from four-year segment, (e.g., system-wide major preparation, on-campus visitations, speakers on community college)	31	34
4.	Increase faculty involvement, (e.g., faculty to faculty contact within disciplines, four-year college faculty review of community college course content)	21	23
5.	Brainstorming (e.g., provide intersegmental discussions on improving, meetings to share ideas); set up district-wide transfer committee	9	10
6.	Set up computerized articulation	9	10
7.	Expand list of acticulation agreements with colleges and universities	6	7
8.	Improve student access to information (timing, information flow, etc.)	10	11
9.	Current methods satisfactory	9	10
10.	Other	15	17

The single largest response category was one which calls upon the four-year colleges for improved or increased assistance. Specifically included in the responses of the 31 colleges (35 percent) who want more from the four-year segments are: a) calls for greater systemwide uniformity in defining requirements, especially in major fields; b) improved coordination, planning and effectiveness of visits of four-year campus personnel to community college campuses; and c) provision of guest speakers on campuses.

Nearly one-fourth of college respondents also said each of the following would improve their articulation efforts:

1. Increase faculty to faculty contact, by discipline, between the segments. Several responses in this category emphasized the need for such contact for purposes of articulating course content and rigor;

2. Assign a person on the community college campus full-time to serve as the articulation officer and chief liaison for intersegmental relations; and

3. Update formal articulation agreements more frequently.

Other less frequently mentioned suggestions for improving current articulation efforts were:

1. Streamline the provision of information on transfer provided to student by improving the formats of transfer information sheets, being sure to get information on four-year college requirements changes in a timely manner, etc.;

2. Computerize information regarding transfer requirements of various institutions; and

3. Increase the number of occasions (on a local or regional level) when community college and four-year faculty and staff can meet to discuss mutual concerns.

Nine colleges (ten percent) indicated, in response to the item, that they feel their current articulation efforts are satisfactory, and suggested no ideas for improvement.

Table II displays the types of liaison activities colleges named in describing their articulation efforts with nearby high schools.

TABLE 11

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting Practices with Respect to Articulation with High Schools

	Response Category	Number	Percent
1.	Counselor assigned to liaison with high schools	47	52
2.	Counselors visit high schools/attend meetings	47	52
3.	Counselors attend college night presentations	35	39
4.	College initiates contact with high school counselors/administrators	31	34
5.	General cooperative effort facilitating contact with high school personnel	9	10
6.	High school students invited on campus for specific program, (e.g., career day)	23	26
7.	High school students enroll in college level	8	9
8.	Other	27	30

A little more than half the colleges (52 percent) indicated that one or more community college counselors is assigned on a regular basis as contacts with local high schools, not only, in some cases, for purposes of meeting with potential student applicants, but also for general liaison purposes. The same number (52 percent) indicated that counselors also attend meetings at local high schools on an ad hoc basis. More than one-third (39 percent) pointed specifically to college personnel (usually counselors) participation in college days/nights sponsored by high schools; and a nearly equivalent number (35 percent) said they host events on the college campus which are designed to inform high school administrators and counselors about developments at the college. Twenty-three colleges (26 percent) also said they host events on campus for high school students, such as "career days." Eight colleges (nine percent) mentioned programs in which high school students enroll concurrently in college courses for credit.

College suggestions for how their current articulation with high schools could be improved are shown on Table 12. The single greatest response (34 colleges, 38 percent) was to increase college faculty involvement with local high schools. These comments included both the suggestion that faculty could be more involved in meeting with potential college students and the suggestion that college faculty should meet more frequently with high schools faculty, by discpline, to improve course articulation and achieve a better understanding of the expectations college faculty hold regarding the competencies students ought to have mastered upon entrance to college.

Another 25 colleges (28 percent) suggested, without specifying faculty or any particular group of adminstrators, that there needs to be increased contact between college and high school personnel in general.

Fifteen colleges (17 percent) noted a need for increased college programs for high school students, and improved or expanded written materials for students about the college.

Finally, 14 colleges (16 percent) suggested that articulation efforts with high schools could be improved if colleges would implement skills assessment procedures for students entering the college from high schools. Included in this category were comments that colleges should establish standards of competence in basic skills and implement proficiency testing and enforce the use of the test results in placing students in various levels of college courses in English and math.

TABLE 12

Number and Percent of Colleges Reporting the Ways Institutions Can Improve Articulation with Local High Schools

Response Category	Number	Percent
1. Increase faculty role, (e.g., meeting with students, faculty to faculty meetings).	34	38
2. Increase contact with high school professionals	25	28
3. Increase programs, written material, provided for high school students	15	17
4. No response	5	6
5. Improving information systems, increasing community college involement in proficiency testing and improving basic skills standards.	14	16
6. Other	26	29

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS

In order to provide a frame of reference for responses to survey questions the following behavioral definitions for "potential transfer students" were developed through collaborative efforts of the Chancellor's staff and representatives of several major community college associations. Please consider these groups of potential transfers as you develop your responses to the questions which follow.

1. Students who were eligible upon high school graduation to attend the University of California (UC) or the California State University and Colleges (CSUS) but instead enrolled in a California Community College.

2. Students who become eligible to transfer to UC by completing 56 transferable units with a 2.4 G.P.A., or who become eligible to transfer to CSUC by completing 56 transferable units with 2.0 G.P.A.

3. Students who are performing successfully in transferable courses, but have not identified as a goal their intent to transfer.

4. Students who are performing successfully in career/vocational courses and programs but have not indicated an intention to transfer.

5. Students who identify the intent to transfer as their goal.

6. Underrepresented students from groups which have not traditionally aspired to or been acknowledged as qualifying for transfer to UC or CSUC.

7. Students who attended UC, CSUC, or some other four-year institution prior to enrolling in a community college but who do not have a baccalaureate degree.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. Does your college have special programs and/or activities designed to identify potential transfer students? (Check one)

   ____ Yes ____ No

   1a. If yes, please list and describe those efforts in the space below.

   1b. If no, please describe how potential transfer students at your college are identified.

2. Please estimate how completely your current efforts identify each of the potential transfer student aggregates listed below by checking the appropriate spaces.

Students who:	Almost All Are Identified	About 3/4 Are Identified	About 1/2 Are Identified	About 1/4 Are Identified	Almost None Are Identified
2a. Are eligible upon high school graduation					
2b. Are in the process of becoming eligible as they earn acceptable GPA in UC/CSUC transferable units					
2c. Are performing successfully in transferable courses with no explicit intentions to transfer					
2d. Are performing successfully in career/vocational courses and programs					
2e. Identify themselves as planning to tranfer					
2f. Previously attended a four-year institution without completing a baccalaureate degree					
2g. Are from groups which have not traditionally aspired to or been acknowledged as qualifying for transfer					
2h. Other (Specify)					

3. Please use the space below to comment on your institution's policy and practice with respect to whether and when it is appropriate to actively encourage students to consider tranferring to a four-year college.

4. In the space below, please list and describe any faculty, counseling department, and/or special program unit activities which are designed to assist potential transfer students once they have been identified.

   Where these efforts do not apply to all of the potential transfer student aggregates at your college, please indicate the groups to which they do apply. Please attach extra pages as necessary.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

5. Please use the space below to comment on your institution's policy and practice with respect to the specific roles of faculty, vis a vis counselors and student services personnel, in identifying and assisting potential transfer students.

6. Does your college require individual or group program advisement for any groups of students? (e.g., first time students, full-time students, EOPS Students, etc.)

(Check one) _____ Yes, individual

_____ Yes, group

_____ Yes, both

_____ No

6a. If Yes, please list the student aggregates (either those listed above or, if those are not applicable to your campus, other aggregates) which are required to have individual or group program advisement in the space below.

Individual Advisement | Group Advisement

6b. If No, please use the following space to indicate why no program advisement is required at this time.

7. Please use the space below to comment on how your college could improve its identification of and/or provision of assistance to potential transfer students.

8. Prior to the establishment of the committe that is completing this form, did your college have a committee or task force dealing primarily or exclusively with transfer issues? (Check one)

_____ Yes _____ No

8a. If Yes, if available, please attach a list of the current membership and a description of the committee/task force charge. If a list is not available, please list its membership and briefly describe its charge in the space below.

9. For each of the educational institutions listed below, please indicate the effectiveness of your college's current articulation efforts:

	Very Effective	Effective	Not Very Effective
9a. For assuring that all potential transfer students are provided adequate information:*			
(1) Local high schools			
(2) Local CSUC campuses			
(3) Local UC campuses			
(4) Local private four-year campuses			
9b. For assuring that all potential transfer students are provided adequate assistance:*			
(1) Local high schools			
(2) Local CSUC campuses			
(3) Local UC campuses			
(4) Local private four-year campuses			

*"Assistance", as over against "information", is used here to mean those activities which involve the active participation of college personnel. Such activities might include conducting visits to 4-year colleges, arranging appointments for students with 4-year college personnel, assisting students with inquiries about specific requirements, etc.

10. Please use the following space to list, and describe as necessary, the ways your college currently articulates with other colleges and universities to assist potential transfer students in transferring.

a.

b.

c.

d.

11. Please use the following space to briefly describe how your college could improve its articulation efforts with other colleges and universities to assist potential transfer students.

12. Please use the following space to briefly describe how your college currently articulates with local high schools.

13. Please use the following space to briefly describe how your college articulation with local high schools might be improved.

14. Does your college have a designated articulation officer? (Check one)

_____ Yes _____ No

14a. If Yes, please list the articulation officer's name, title, college mailing address, and telephone number.

Name Title

College Mailing Address

Telephone Number

15. In the following spaces, please provide the names and titles of the persons who prepared the responses to this survey.

(Name) (Title)

Thank you for your attention and effort in completing this questionnaire. If you would like to receive a copy of the results, please check the space provided and include the name and the address of the person to whom you would like the results sent.

Please send us copies of the survey results

Name _____

Address _____

_____

16. The following space is provided for any additional comments you would like to make concerning the identification of or the provision of assistance to potential transfer students, or about the survey itself.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

DEC 10 1982